



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the Secretary-Treasurer was unanimously adopted by the Executive Committee. Negotiations in detail were conducted and completed by the Secretary-Treasurer and, as a result, The Latin Leaflet came into the possession of the Association and on the first Saturday in October, 1907, number 1 of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, owned and published by The Classical Association of the Middle States and Maryland, appeared. Professor Gonzalez Lodge, of Teachers College, Columbia University, was Editor-in-Chief. His Associates were Professor Knapp, Professor H. L. Wilson of The Johns Hopkins University, Professor Mitchell Carroll, of the George Washington University, and Dr. Ernst Riess, of the Boys High School, Brooklyn. Professor Lodge remained the Editor-in-Chief to the end of May 1913, that is, to the close of Volume 6. At the meeting of the Association held in Baltimore in May, 1913, he resigned as Editor-in-Chief and by vote of the Executive Committee, confirmed subsequently by the Association, Professor Knapp was made Managing Editor. Since that time the Associate Editors have been Professor Charles E. Bennett, of Cornell University; Professor Walter Dennison, Swarthmore College; Professor Walton Brooks McDaniel, University of Pennsylvania; Professor David M. Robinson, The Johns Hopkins University; Professor B. L. Ullman, University of Pittsburgh; Professor H. H. Yeames, Hobart College, Geneva, New York.

To many persons statistics constitute the least nourishing of all forms of mental sustenance. I know of no better way, however, to picture the growth of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States than to group here certain statistics concerning the financial transactions of the Association, the growth of its membership, the facts concerning the number of subscribers apart from members, etc.

In the Association account the receipts for the nine years since the first Annual Meeting (no money had been received prior to that time) have been as follows: \$617.51, 959.55, 1480.97, 1394.71, 1424.38, 1698.88, 1985.25, 2144.29, 1714.68 (these receipts, as those of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY below, of course include balances carried forward: in 1915, it should be remembered, \$357.43 was transferred to a Savings Bank account: this makes the figures for 1915-1916 seem smaller than those of the preceding years). Expenditures were \$530.26, 829.99, 1024.32, 1033.33, 1010.81, 1251.96, 1459.56, 2136.15, 1399.01 (the expenditures in 1914-1915 were increased by transfer of \$357.43 to Savings Bank). Balances were \$87.25, 129.56, 456.65, 361.38, 413.57, 446.92, 525.69, 8.14 (365.57), 315.61 (675.66).

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY account the figures have been as follows: Receipts, \$1128.74, 1294.01, 1788.64, 1562.35, 1819.94, 2081.98, 2692.32, 3120.41, 2623.26 (\$500 was transferred to Savings Bank, in 1915). Expenditures: \$1041.45, 898.68, 1534.65, 1175.13, 1283.00, 1328.04, 1829.98, 2653.01 (\$500 transferred to Savings Bank), \$1953.72. Balances, \$87.29, 395.33, 253.99, 387.22, 536.94, 753.94, 862.34, 467.40 (967.40), 669.54 (\$1184.73).

Total balances, \$174.54, 524.89, 510.64, 748.60, 950.51, 1200.86, 1388.03, 1332.97, 1860.33.

The figures for membership have been as follows: 287, 425, 528, 535, 497, 575, 683, 704, 722. For subscriptions from non-members, the figures have been 268, 278, 312, 398, 499, 588, 630, 715, 794. Totals, 555, 703, 840, 933, 996, 1133, 1313, 1419, 1516.

C. K.

TWO NOTES ON THE ILIAD

2.91 ff.: ὥς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἀπο καὶ κλισιάων
ἡόνος προπάρειθε βαθείης ἐστιχόωντο.

The epithet *βαθείης* has been variously interpreted as 'broad', 'low', or 'deep-bayed'. The first and second of these meanings do not, however, properly belong to the adjective, while the third does not apply to the very slightly concave shore of the Trojan plain.

The Greeks before Troy used the beach as a sort of street along which they could easily go from one part of their 'broad' camp to another. At low tide, no doubt, they preferred to walk on the moist, hard sand near the water rather than through the dry, loose sand which lay beyond the reach of the tides. This, I take it, is what the poet indicates by saying that they walked 'in front of the deep sand'.

It may be objected that Homer's word for sand is *ψάμαθος*, while *ἡών* means 'beach', 'shore'. As a matter of fact, Hesychius and Suidas gloss the latter word by *αἰγιαλός*, and a distinction seems to be drawn between *ἡών* and *ψάμαθος* in a line which occurs in Iliad 7. 462 and, with slight variation, in Iliad 12. 31:

αἶψις δ' ἡίονα μέγαλιν ψαμάθοισι καλύψαι.

Even here, however, the two words are near together, since the beach and the sands must be the same material looked at from different points of view; the poet has in mind simply the levelling effect of the waves when they submerge a sand-bank upon which men—or children—have thrown up a mound. One may perhaps compare Aristophanes's whimsical use of *αἰγιαλός* as a collective noun equivalent to *ψῆφοι πολλοί* (Vespae 110). At any rate there is no reason to suppose that *ἡών* could not mean sand as well as sandy beach.

If we admit the former meaning we not only obtain a satisfactory interpretation of the word *βαθείης* in Iliad 2. 92, but we also find an etymology and a meaning for the adjective *ἡόεις*, which appears as an epithet of the Scamander in Iliad 5. 36. It is clear from Iliad 21. 202 and 319 that the poet thought of the Scamander as a sandy stream. Homer, it is true, nowhere uses *ἡών* of a river bank; but in view of the comparative rarity of the word the argument *ex silentio* has little weight. Compare what Aeschylus makes Cassandra say in Agamemnon 1157 ff.

3.64 ff.: μή μοι δῶρ' ἐρατὰ πρόφερε χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης.
οὐ τοι ἀπρόβλητ' ἐστὶ θεῶν ἐρικυδέα δῶρα,
ὅσσα κεν αὐτοὶ δῶσιν, ἐκὼν δ' οὐκ ἂν τις ἔλοιτο.

The optative in the last line is usually supposed to be a 'can' potential and *ἐκὼν* is given a full participial force: 'and no one could get them by choosing them'. Leaf rightly objects that this is not the proper force of *ἐκὼν*; but he does not help matters much by his suggestion that the line is a "gnomic addition" to the original poem. It seems preferable to give the word a meaning which it has elsewhere in Homer.

According to Iliad 10. 372, Diomedes hurled his spear over Dolon's shoulder, *ἐκὼν δ' ἡμάρτανε φωτός*. This force of the word would make our passage mean: 'but of his own accord no one would choose them'. There is perhaps an allusion to line 45 where Hector contrasts *καλὸν εἶδος* with *βίη* and *ἀλκή*, so that Paris means to say, 'I would not voluntarily choose good looks rather than strength and valor'. The clause thus forms a transition from his apology for his effeminate appearance to his proposal of the duel with Menelaus.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

WACKERNAGEL ON THE TEXT OF HOMER

Readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY may be glad to have their attention called to an important article on the Attic Influence upon our text of Homer, published by J. Wackernagel in Glotta 7. 161-319. The article is entitled Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer. No scholar with a knowledge of scientific Greek grammar has doubted the presence of Atticisms in our text of Homer, but only a few, probably, have hitherto realized how considerable the Attic element really is.

Wackernagel divides his material into two groups. The first and larger group consists of Atticisms which may be explained as modernizations of originally Ionic words or forms. For example, our text of Homer presents the future of *δμνυμι* in its Attic form as *δμοῦμαι*, *δμεῖται*, etc. Now Ionic would have contracted *δμέομαι* into *δμεῦμαι* and *δμόσται* into *δμοῦται*; and so either *δμοῦμαι* or *δμεῖται* must be due to Attic influence. But since the Attic and Ionic forms had the same prosodic value, it is quite possible that the original Homeric text was in this respect consistently Ionic.

In his second group Wackernagel places Atticisms which cannot be translated into Ionic without destroying the meter, and which, therefore, must be due to the original composers of the lines in which they stand. A part of the material here discussed is more or less dubious, but, after all allowances have been made, there remains a considerable residue of forms and idioms which must stand as valid evidence for the Attic origin of single lines or, in some cases, of longer passages of the poems. For example, there are two such forms in the introduction to the Teichoscopia in Iliad 3. In line 153 we read *ἦντ'* for Homeric *ἦατο* and later Ionic (*κατ')*ἦατο, where both the Atticism and the impossibility of emendation are beyond question. The phrase *δενδρέφ' ἐφεζόμενοι*, which most manuscripts and printed texts present in 152, will not scan unless we read the Attic form *δένδρφ*. It has to be admitted, however, that *δένδρφ* does not actually appear in the text, and that one manuscript remedies the metrical defect by reading *ἐζόμενοι*.

It is not likely that all of Wackernagel's conclusions will stand the test of time, but one may at least say

that this is the most important grammatical contribution to the Homeric question that has appeared for many years.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

REVIEWS

Studies in the History of the Roman Province of Syria.

By Gustave Adolphus Harrer. Princeton: Princeton University Press (1915). Pp. 94.

The present learned and heavily documented dissertation is devoted to chronological studies of the sequence in office of the provincial governors of Syria. The peculiar order of treatment, whereby the governors from 69-194 A. D. are considered separately (pages 11-42), and before any notice is paid to those of the period anterior to 69 A. D. (pages 63-65), seems to be due to the fact that the list of governors from the beginning down to the great revolt, as given in the latest edition of Schürer's *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes* (1904), was so nearly complete as to leave opportunity for only a few scattered notes, whereas the accession of new material since the publication of Liebenam's *Die Legaten in den Römischen Provinzen von Augustus bis Diocletian* (1888) suggested the need of a thoroughgoing revision of the lists for this period. The study is essentially, therefore, a revision of Liebenam's work, and as such it marks a really considerable contribution to knowledge as compared with the average doctoral dissertation. However, since it is a series of discussions of minute chronological problems, it is accordingly impossible to summarize the contents, otherwise than to notice that, in addition to what has already been indicated, similar lists are prepared for the governors of Syria Coele and Syria Phoenice from 194-circa 300 A. D., and the procurators of Syria, Syria Coele and Syria Phoenice. Then follows an interesting discussion of the proper date and course of the revolt of Pescennius Niger, in which Wilcken's view that it was confined to 193 A. D. is firmly established; after that comes a short examination of the date of the division of Syria; then a note on C. I. L. III, 6169; a brief Index Nominum, which would have been more valuable had it been expanded to include all the principal persons and topics discussed; and, finally, a short Appendix. The whole gives evidence of industry, sobriety of judgment, and correct methods of research. I should like in particular to note an emendation (page 29) in *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes* III, 1274 where the commonly accepted reading *ἐπὶ Ἀπικίων* is convincingly emended to *ἐπὶ Σουλπικίων*.

The proofreading has not been done very carefully, but since the errors will not mislead the specialist, and dissertations are not likely to reach a second edition, I see no use in solemnly rehearsing such petty blemishes. There are other blemishes, however, which are not to be so easily explained or condoned. Thus "Gk." is an unfortunate abbreviation for the